



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/618,367	07/18/2000	Stan Jirman	APLE.P0005	8886
62224 7590 03/20/2007 STATTLER, JOHANSEN, AND ADELI LLP 1875 CENTURY PARK EAST SUITE 1360 LOS ANGELES, CA 90067			EXAMINER CAO, DIEM K	
			ART UNIT 2194	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/20/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/618,367	JIRMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Diem K. Cao	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-38 are pending. Applicant has amended claims

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 10-18, 21-25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 10, 21 and 23 are directed to computer systems, however, the claims fail to recite any physical articles or objects, and therefore, fail to meet the requirement of being a machine or manufacture. See MPEP 2106.

Claims 11-17 depend on claim 10 and do not provide any physical articles or objects, and therefore, also fail to meet the requirement of being a machine or manufacture.

Claim 22 depends on claim 21 and fails to provide any physical articles or objects, and therefore, also fails to meet the requirement of being a machine or manufacture.

Claims 24-25 and 29 are depended on claim 23, and fail to teach any physical articles or objects, and therefore, also fail to meet the requirement of being a machine or manufacture

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2194

4. Claims 1-9, 11, 14, 24 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation " the start time, end time and information" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 11 recites the limitation " the event object" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 24 recites the limitation " the event object" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 31 recites "creating, for the event object, an enabled/disabled status ... of applications", however, the specification seems to disclose checking the enable/disable status for each event, and if the event status is enable, then an event object is created for the corresponding event (page 7, lines 12-26). Examiner interprets the claim as "creating, for the event, an enabled/disabled status ... of application" for the examining purpose.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 10, 12-13, 23-26, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kaler et al. (U.S. 6,742,143 B2).

As to claim 10, Kaler teaches a foundational layer upon which applications are built or executed (middleware or the operating system or in both; col. 26, lines 56-57), and an event logging mechanism created by the foundational layer (VSA 100 activates an LEC; col. 11, lines 30-31 and one local event concentrator for each machine; col. 11, lines 56-57 and col. 14, line 53 - col. 15, line 6), the logging mechanism executing independent of the applications (the LEC process runs at a lower than normal priority and Fig. 7), the mechanism for generating an event log for any of the applications, without referencing any event logs of the applications (col. 12, lines 8-10), the logging mechanism for turning on or off at any time during the execution of the applications by an entity external to the applications (VSA 100 ... event; col. 11, lines 30-34).

As to claim 12, Kaler teaches the foundational layer is an operating system (operating system; col. 26, line 47).

As to claim 13, Kaler teaches the foundational layer is a programmable framework (middleware; col. 26, line 56).

As to claim 23, Kaler teaches a system comprising:

- a foundational layer upon which applications are executed (middleware or the operating system or in both; col. 26, lines 56-57),

- a first application for executing on the foundational layer (one of the applications 190; col. 11, lines 54),
- a second application for executing on the foundational layer (another one of the applications 190),
- an event logging mechanism for execution on the foundational layer (VSA 100 activates an LEC; col. 11, lines 30-31 and one local event concentrator for each machine; col. 11, lines 56-57 and col. 14, line 53 - col. 15, line 6), for functioning interoperably with but separate from the first and second applications (the LEC process runs at a lower than normal priority and Fig. 7), and for generating an event log for each of the first and second applications (col. 12, lines 8-10), wherein at least one of the first and second applications does not generate an event log (col. 12, lines 29-45), wherein the event logging mechanism is separate from the first and second applications and is not compiled with the applications (col. 26, line 56 - col. 27, line 4, lines 25-31).

As to claim 24, Kaler teaches generating an event log comprises storing, for each event to be logged, a temporal attribute of an event in an event object associated with the event (col. 16, table 1).

As to claim 25, Kaler teaches (col. 16, lines 28-67 and col. 33, lines 23-24, lines 34-50, lines 50-55) the event logging mechanism is configured to analyze the event objects based upon hierarchical (tree, level) and contextual grouping (categories).

A to claim 26, Kaler teaches a first area of memory allocated to the first application (process space of one of the applications 190; col. 11, lines 51-55), a second area of memory allocated to the second application (process space of another application of one of the applications 190; col. 11, lines 51-55), and a third area memory allocated to the event logging mechanism (LEC 199; see Fig. 7 and LEC process; col. 13, lines 35-36), wherein the third area of memory is separate from the areas of memory allocated to the first and second applications (see Fig. 7 and associated text).

As to claim 28, Kaler teaches generating an event log is performed for each event having event logging enabled (col. 12, lines 33-42).

As to claim 29, Kaler teaches the foundational layer is an operating system upon which applications are executed (operating system; col. 26, line 47).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 15-18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler et al. (U.S. 6,742,143 B2).**

As to claim 15, Kaler does not teach the event logging mechanism can be turned on and turned off and configured using a browser application. However, Kaler teaches the event logging mechanism can be turned on and off and configured using an application from another computer in the network (col. 14, lines 63-65). It would have been obvious that the application could be a browser application because browser application has been utilized in the art for transfer data/request/response between computers.

As to claim 16, Kaler teaches the event logging mechanism generates a plurality of event objects (col. 12, lines 1-9) and is configured to analyze the event objects and present to the browser application the results thereof (display of performance data; col. 33, lines 23-24, lines 34-50, lines 50-55).

As to claim 17, Kaler teaches (col. 16, lines 28-67 and col. 33, lines 23-24, lines 34-50, lines 50-55) the event logging mechanism is configured to analyze the event objects based upon hierarchical (tree, level) and contextual grouping (categories).

As to claim 18, Kaler teaches the event logging mechanism is configured to aggregate the event objects deemed identical based upon at least one of hierarchical and contextual grouping (sublevel; col. 33, lines 23-24, lines 34-50, lines 50-55).

As to claim 27, Kaler teaches wherein the disable state precludes any system from creating an event log (If IsActive returns False ... FireEvent; col. 12, lines 42-43). Kaler does not

Art Unit: 2194

teach turning on and off separate for each event. However, Kaler teaches the turning on and off separate for each data source (col. 12, lines 39-42). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modified the system of Kaler to turning on and off separate for each event record only what the user is interested in at time.

9. Claims 1-9, 11, 14, 19-22 and 30-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler et al. (U.S. 6,742,143 B2) in view of Ward et al. (U.S. 2002/0083217 A1).

As to claim 1, Kaler teaches a method comprising for an event to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application:

- creating an event object (the function of an IEC is to ... create an event ... analyzed; col. 4, lines 9-13 and events created by IEC ... LEC 199; col. 12, lines 1-11), the event object occupying a memory space that is independent of the application (buffer; col. 13, lines 21-26 and events are retained ... buffer; col. 22, lines 17-22),

- logging within the event object start time and information regarding the event (pre-defined event fields, time, source process, etc; col. 15, lines 31-41 and col. 16, lines 1-25),

- wherein the creating and the logging are performed on a single computer on which the application executes (see Figs. 3, 7 and col. 11, line 50 - col. 12, line 11).

Kaler does not explicitly teach start time and end time. Kaler teaches only time (time; col. 16, line 23). However, Ward teaches logging within the event object start time and end time (time start, time end; page 7, paragraphs 73-74).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Ward to the system of Kaler because it enables a user to preform desired evaluation on a currently executing application in real-time without adversely affecting the performance of the computer graphics system (page 2, paragraph 17).

As to claim 2, Kaler teaches checking whether event logging has been turned on for the event (The APIs ... status condition is set; col. 27, lines 48-55).

As to claim 3, Kaler teaches the creating and logging are performed for each event having event logging turned on (The APIs ... status condition is set; col. 27, lines 48-55 and col. 12, lines 33-41), wherein a plurality of event objects are created and logged for a plurality of events (col. 12, lines 1-7).

As to claim 4, Kaler does not explicitly teach analyzing the event objects after event logging is turned off. However, Kaler teaches analyzing the event objects at any time (col. 14, line 53 - col. 15, line 15). It would have been obvious that the analyzing the event object can occur after the event logging is turned off because it's just different implementation as desired by the users.

As to claim 5, Kaler teaches wherein analyzing includes:

- allowing user definition of the hierarchical levels of granularity of the events whose event objects are to be analyzed (tree; col. 16, lines 28-39), and

- allowing user definition of contexts for differentiating repeated occurrences of events deemed identical by nature of their hierarchical position (event type; col. 16, lines 52-64 and col. 17, line 5-10).

As to claim 6, wherein analyzing further includes:

- grouping events into their hierarchical subgroups (tree, subtree; col. 16, lines 28-39),
and
- grouping events by their context, if any are defined (event type; col. 16, lines 52-64 and Begin/End, Outbound/Inbound; col. 17, line 5-10).

As to claim 7, Kaler teaches (col. 16, lines 29-39 and col. 25, lines 38-50 and col. 32, lines 10-48) wherein analyzing comprises:

- traversing though the hierarchy of subgroups until the subgroup of finest granularity is traversed (tree, leaves, branches),
- subdividing the events into further subgroups (branches, categories),
- computing statistics for each subgroup while traversing (see Fig. 16 and associated text), and
- displaying the statistics (see Fig. 16 see Fig. 19).

As to claim 8, Kaler teaches (col. 16, lines 29-39 and col. 25, lines 38-50 and col. 32, lines 10-48) wherein if the subgroup of finest granularity has been traversed, then

- aggregating events deemed identical by virtue of their hierarchical position into an

Art Unit: 2194

aggregate (which events need to be ... grouped and connected; col. 31, lines 30-37),

- computing statistics for each aggregate (analysis; col. 33, lines 23-40), and
- displaying the statistics for each the aggregate (display of performance data; col. 33, lines 23-24, lines 34-50, lines 50-55).

As to claim 9, wherein the analyzing includes:

- aggregating events deemed identical by virtue of their context into an aggregate (which events need to be ... grouped and connected; col. 31, lines 30-37, sublevels, subdivide; col. 33, lines 50-55),
- computing statistics for each aggregate (analysis; col. 33, lines 23-40), and
- displaying the statistics for each aggregate (display of performance data; col. 33, lines 23-24, lines 34-50, lines 50-55).

As to claim 11, Kaler teaches the event logging mechanism logs time and other event information into an event object for each event to be logged (pre-defined event fields, time, source process, etc; col. 15, lines 31-41 and col. 16, lines 1-25).

Kaler does not explicitly teach start time and end time. Kaler teaches only time (time; col. 16, line 23). However, Ward teaches logging within the event object start time and end time (time start, time end; page 7, paragraphs 73-74).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Ward to the system of Kaler because it enables a user to perform desired evaluation on a currently executing application in real-time without adversely

Art Unit: 2194

affecting the performance of the computer graphics system (page 2, paragraph 17).

As to claim 14, Kaler teaches the event logging mechanism can be turned on and then off from beyond the execution space of the applications within the foundation layer (VSA 100 ... event; col. 11, lines 30-34). Kaler does not teach turning on and off separate for each event. However, Kaler teaches the turning on and off separate for each data source (col. 12, lines 39-42). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modified the system of Kaler to turning on and off separate for each event record only what the user is interested in at time.

As to claim 19, it is the same as the method claim of claim 1 except it is a computer article claim, and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

As to claim 20, see rejection of claim 17 above.

As to apparatus claim 21, it is the same as the method claim of claim 1 and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

As to claim 22, see rejection of claim 20 above.

As to claim 30, see rejection of claim 1 above.

As to claim 31, see rejection of claim 27 above.

As to claim 32, Kaler teaches checking, for each event identified by an application within the plurality of applications, whether event logging has been enabled (col. 12, lines 33-42).

As to claim 33, see rejection of claim 4 above.

As to claim 34, Kaler teaches the memory space occupied by the event log is within memory space that has been allocated solely to the event logging mechanism (buffer; col. 13, lines 21-26 and events are retained ... buffer; col. 22, lines 17-22).

As to claim 35, Kaler teaches wherein the events that are logged by the event logging mechanism have not been previously logged by any other application (col. 12, lines 1-11).

As to claim 36, Kaler teaches the information placed in the event log is first logged by the event logging mechanism (col. 12, lines 33-42).

As to claim 37, Kaler teaches an enable/disable state wherein the disable state precludes any system from creating an event log (col. 12, lines 41-43).

As to claim 38, Kaler teaches the creating is done by a foundational layer that is a development framework (middleware or the operating system or in both; col. 26, lines 56-57).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The last Final Office action has been withdrawn.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K. Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-3760. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30AM - 3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2194

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DC
March 12, 2007


TIM D. DAN
SUPERVISORY PARENT EXAMINER